# INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

#### 2006-2007 COMPLIANCE AND ON-SITE MONITORING REPORT

#### FOR:

### **Spectra Services**

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS	OBSERVATION		COMPLIANCE	
	Lesson matches		Criminal Background	
Tutor Qualifications	original description	Satisfactory	Checks	
			Health/safety laws &	
Recruiting Materials	Instruction is clear	Satisfactory	regulations	
	Time on task is			
Academic Program	appropriate	Satisfactory	Financial viability	
	Instructor is			
	appropriately			
Progress Reporting	knowledgeable	Satisfactory		
	Student/instructor			
	<b>ratio:</b> 5:1, 8:1, 4:1	Satisfactory		

## **ACTION NEEDED: NONE**

Provider submitted a corrective action plan describing the steps Spectra will take to ensure that transition times are more structured and organized. Spectra also developed a professional development plan to train tutors on how to minimize transition times and maintain order while students are transitioning.

(As per the on-site monitoring rubric instructions, while monitoring/observation of SES providers is completed annually, document and compliance analysis is completed every two years. Since Spectra's document and compliance analysis was completed during the 2005-2006 school year, only an observation was completed for the 2006-2007 school year).

# **On-site Monitoring Rubric OBSERVATION Components**

NAME OF PROVIDER: Spectra Services

SITE: Delaney Education Center (Gary, IN)

REVIEWERS: MC/KS

TUTOR'S INITIALS (ALL TUTORS OBSERVED): 4 tutors

TIME OF OBSERVATION: 4:15 PM

**NUMBER OF LESSONS OBSERVED: 3** 

During the site visit, IDOE personnel will visit several tutoring sessions to observe lessons being provided. IDOE reviewers will be looking to see that actual tutoring matches lesson plan descriptions that are provided in requested documents, as well as those that were provided in the original provider application; that tutors and students are spending an appropriate amount of time on task; that instruction is clear and understandable; and that instructors seem knowledgeable about lesson content.

Each provider will receive a mark of "Satisfactory" (S) or "Unsatisfactory" (U) for each component. Providers receiving a "U" in any component may be required to address deficiencies within 7 calendar days of receiving their final report. Failure to address deficiencies may result in removal from the state approved list.

COMPONENT		***	DEVIEWED COMMENTS
COMPONENT	S	U	REVIEWER COMMENTS
			Students were separated into groups based on academic level. Students transitioned from one group
			to another at designated periods. One group worked on the computers completing lessons that were
			prescribed for each of them. These students were facilitated by a tutor who walked around & helped
			when needed. Another group worked on workbooks and worksheets (one group was doing reading,
			one group was doing math). Students did some work independently and some work with the support
Lesson matches original description in			of a tutor. The tutor introduced the concept and provided instructions, and then the students worked
provider application	X		independently.
			Instructors were generally able to ensure that students knew what they were supposed to be working
			on. At times, students working on the computer or independently did not seem to know what to do
			next when they had finished an activity. Instructions provided for the transition did not appear to be
			clear to students. The transition was somewhat chaotic; students did not know where they were
			supposed to go or what they were supposed to be doing. The transition took about 5-10 minutes and
Instruction is clear	X		then additional time was needed to calm students down and get them back on task.
			Students were generally on task, although students working independently sometimes got off task
			when the tutor was not present. As noted above, the transition from one group to the next was
			chaotic and caused students to lose some learning time, as students and instructors tried to figure out
Time on task is appropriate	X		where everyone should go.
			Instructors appeared to be aware of students' academic levels (based on the group to which they
			were assigned). In some of the small group work, it did not appear that instructors always checked
			to ensure that everyone in the group understood concepts. In addition, instructors did not always
Instructor is appropriately knowledgeable	X		seem to know how to effectively facilitate organized transitions.
The state of the s	<u> </u>		Students working on computers had about an 8:1 ratio; other groups were smaller, such as 3:1 or 4:1.
Student/instructor ratio: 8:1 or less	X		8:1 or less matches description in provider application.
		l	1